

## **REMARKS**

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated February 22, 2008. Claims 1 and 4-6 will be pending. Claims 1 and 6 will be the independent claims. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. It is believed that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The inventive device comprises user interface means, metadata processing means for processing and parsing received XML-formatted EPG information, storage means, searching means and controlling means. Claims 1 and 4-6, all the pending claims, require both that the metadata processing means display the processed EPG information and searched information by using an UI API (user interface Application Program Interface) and that the metadata processing means store the processed EPG information and searched information by using a database management system API. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 6 is found in the application as originally filed, so that it can be seen that no new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected all the pending claims as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in light of a combination of U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0166123 (“Schrader *et al*”), U.S. Pat. Appl. Publ. No. 2001/0013123 (“Freeman *et al*.”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,163,316 (“Killian”). Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Nothing in the proposed combination would have suggested a device or method where the metadata processing means stores the processed EPG information and searched information by using database management system API. As acknowledged by Examiner at page 4 of the Office Action, neither Schrader *et al* nor Schrader *et al*. would have disclosed such a feature.

Moreover, Killian fails to disclose storing the XML-formatted EPG information and searched information by using a database management system API as claimed in claim 1 or storing the extracted metadata or the searched EPG information by using database management system API as claim in claim 6. Database server 46 is the only storage medium that uses any kind of API in the operation of the platform 12 disclosed by Killian. However, the platform

described by Killian can only access data stored in the database server; it cannot store data in the DB server. In particular, Killian teaches only that:

“Toolkit 58 also includes an electronic programming guide (EPG) API 60 that contains classes for querying for, retrieving, and manipulating program listing information 6 contained in program listing database 48, constructing and modifying viewer profiles according to viewer preferences, constructing electronic scheduling displays according to viewer profiles and selected program listing information 6, and providing other desirable functionalities that allow viewers to more intelligently select, schedule, and record viewing opportunities.”

(Col. 7, lines 49-58.)

Killian does not suggest storing XML-formatted EPG information and searched information using a database management system API. Therefore, nothing in Killian whether considered alone whether considered in combination with Schrader *et al.* and Freeman *et al.* would have made obvious any of claims, so that the rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, claims 1 and 4-6 are in condition for allowance, so that a prompt and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA

Date: June 23, 2008

By \_\_\_\_\_  
  
Jeffrey F. Craft  
Registration No. 30,044  
Attorney for Applicant